UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,956	06/22/2001	Bohdan T. Iwanojko	42390P11651	7674

8791	7590	12/23/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER
KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the c rrespondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 June 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disp sition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 06/22/01.

2. Claims 1-42 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
> United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
> by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
> title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1,2,4,5,7-25,27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Lim et al. USPN 6,434,619 (hereinafter "Lim").

Regarding claim 1, Lim anticipates method (Col.23: 9 to Col.24: 7), system

(Col.21: 45 to Col.23:8), machine readable (Fig.3, see Database) and apparatus (Fig

2), comprising:

receiving a set of configuration parameter change requests within a transaction

(Col.3: 53-57);

checksetting the set of configuration parameter change requests within the

transaction (Col.6:1-5, see status and statistics); and

executing the set of configuration parameter change requests within the

transaction (Col.3:55-60, see processed).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1 wherein said receiving a set of

configuration parameter change requests within a transaction comprises receiving

requests to change at least two configuration parameters of a module (Col.4: 52 to Col.

5: 20).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1 wherein said checksetting the set of configuration parameter change requests within the transaction comprises requesting validation of configuration parameter change requests (Col.13:15-17, see verify).

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1 wherein said checksetting the set of configuration parameter change requests within the transaction comprises receiving a response to requesting validation of configuration parameter change requests (Col.5:15-20).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim I wherein said executing the set of configuration parameter change requests within the transaction comprises rejecting configuration parameter change requests (Col.12:55-60).

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1 wherein said executing the set of configuration parameter change requests within the transaction comprises deleting a temporary configuration parameter change requests database (Col.11:1-7).

Regarding claim 9, the method of claim 1 wherein said executing the set of configuration parameter change requests within the transaction comprises requesting a change to a configuration parameter in a module (Col.14: 25 - 35).

Regarding claim 11, Lim anticipates an apparatus, comprising:

a configuration manager (Fig.2); and

a module coupled to said configuration manager (Fig.2, also see Fig. 3, For CLIENT UI Module).

Regarding claim 12, the apparatus of claim 11, further comprising a management client coupled to said configuration manager (Fig.2, see CSM, CSM agent, CUSTOME END-USER BROWSERS).

Regarding claim 13, the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said configuration manager comprises a microprocessor coupled to a memory device (Fig.3, CSM AGENT and DATABASE).

Regarding claim 14, the apparatus of claim 13, wherein the memory device comprises memory to store configuration parameter change requests (Fig. 3, see Database utilitly, EVENT LOGGING).

Regarding claim 15, the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said configuration manager comprises a microprocessor to checkset and execute configuration parameter change requests within a transaction (Col.6:1-5, see status and statistics Col.3:55-60, see processed).

Regarding claim 16, the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said module comprises circuitry to perform a function of said node (Fig.3, see client UI module).

Regarding claim 17, the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said module comprises a module to validate a configuration parameter (Col.13:15-17, see verify, also see (Col.5:15-20).

Regarding claim 18, the apparatus of claim 11, wherein said module comprises a module to transact with a management workstation (Fig.3, see Client UI and SERVICE MGMT module).

Regarding claim 19, which is the system version of claim 1, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 20, which is the system version of claim 12, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 21, which is the system version of claim 15, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 22, the system of claim 19, wherein said station comprises a server (Fig. 3, see SERVER MGMT).

Regarding claim 23, the system of claim 19, wherein said station comprises a workstation (Fig. 3, see CLIENT UI).

Regarding claim 24, which is the machine readable version of claim 1, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 25, which is the machine readable version of claim 2, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 27, which is the machine readable version of claim 4, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 28, which is the machine readable version of claim 5, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3,6,10,26,29, & 30 - 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lim et al. USPN 6,434,619 (hereinafter "Lim"), as applied in claim 1,

claim 9 and claim 24, in view of Bigo et al. USPN 5,261,099 (hereinafter "Bigo").

Regarding claim 3, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 1

above. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said receiving a set of configuration

parameter change requests within a transaction comprises receiving configuration

parameters in an incorrect sequence. However, Bigo does disclose this limitation in a

similar configuration (Col.14:55-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo

because, being able to detect incorrect or erroneous or invalid request during

configuration would make the system more secure and maintainable.

Regarding claim 6, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 1

above. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said checksetting the set of configuration

parameter change requests within the transaction comprises determining a corrected

sequence for configuration parameter change requests. However, Bigo does disclose

this limitation in a similar configuration (Col. 14:65-67, also see Col.15:40-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, being able to detect valid or

correct request during configuration would make the system more secure and

maintainable.

Regarding claim 10, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 1 above. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose wherein requesting a change to a configuration parameter in a module comprises initiating configuration parameter change requests within the transaction in a corrected sequence. However, Bigo does disclose this limitation in a similar configuration (Col.17:33-35 Col.15:40-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, being able to detect valid or correct request during configuration would make the system more secure and maintainable.

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 9.

Regarding claim 26, which is the machine readable version of claim 3, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 29, which is the machine readable version of claim 6, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 30, which is the machine readable version of claim 10, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 31, Lim discloses a device, comprising:

a port to receive a set of configuration parameter change requests within a transaction (Col.3:54-57). Lim doesn't explicitly disclose determining a corrected sequence for the transaction via validation of a change request within the transaction. However, Bigo does disclose this feature (Col.14:65 - Col.15:15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, being able to detect valid or correct sequences during a request for configuration change would make the system more secure and maintainable.

Regarding claim 32, the device of claim 31, further comprising a management client module to bridge the change request from said port to said configuration manager (Lim, Fig.2, see CSM).

Regarding claim 33, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 31 above. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose comprising a temporary configuration parameter change requests database coupled to said configuration manager to store

data to determine the corrected sequence for the transaction. However, Bigo does disclose this limitation in a similar configuration (Col. 15:10-15, see check). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, being able to detect valid or correct request during configuration would make the system more secure and maintainable.

Regarding claim 34, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 31 above. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose, wherein the module comprises circuitry coupled to said configuration manager to respond to a request for validation of the change request with a repeat call. However, Bigo does disclose this limitation in a similar configuration (Col.14:64-67, for repeatable see consecutive, also see Col. 9:52-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, repeating or making consecutive requests for changing the configuration would increase the likelihood that the request would be fulfilled and hence improve efficiency.

Regarding claim 35, the device of claim 31, wherein the module comprises circuitry of a microprocessor coupled to said configuration manager and having a configuration parameter subject to the transaction to function as a run-time variable (Lim, Col.16: 53-55).

Regarding claim 36, the device of claim 31, wherein said port comprises circuitry to receive the transaction coupled to circuitry to forward the transaction to said configuration manager (Lim, Fig.3)

Regarding claim 37, the device of claim 36, wherein the circuitry to receive the transaction comprises a network management protocol module (Lim, Col.3:20-25, see SNMP).

Regarding claim 38, the device of claim 3 1, wherein said configuration manager comprises circuitry coupled to the module to request validation of the change request by the module (Lim, Col. 5:15-20).

Regarding claim 39, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 31. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose a port to receive a set of configuration parameter change requests within a transaction. However, Bigo does disclose this feature (Col.3:

54-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, being able to detect valid or correct sequences during a request for configuration change would make the system more secure and maintainable.

Regarding claim 40, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 38 above. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose wherein the circuitry coupled to a module to determine a corrected sequence comprises circuitry coupled to the module to receive the response and coupled to a temporary configuration parameter change requests database to associate the response with the change request. However, Bigo does disclose this limitation in a similar configuration (Col. 15:10-15, see check). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, being able to detect valid or correct request during configuration would make the system more secure and maintainable.

Regarding claim 41, the device of claim 31, wherein said configuration manager comprises circuitry coupled to the module to execute the set of configuration parameter change requests based upon the corrected sequence for the transaction.

Regarding claim 42, Lim discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 31 above. Lim doesn't explicitly disclose wherein the circuitry to execute the set of configuration parameter change requests comprises circuitry coupled to the module to change a run-time variable of the module according to the change request. However, Bigo does disclose this limitation in a similar configuration (Col. 15:10-15, see check). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lim and Bigo because, being able to detect valid or correct request during configuration would make the system more secure and maintainable.

Correspondence Information

6.   Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck O.

Kendall who may be reached via telephone at (703) 308-6608. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam *can be* reached at *(703) 305-4552.*

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is *(703) 305-3900.*

For facsimile (fax) send to 703-7467239 official and 703-7467240 draft

Chuck O. Kendall

Software Engineer Patent Examiner

United States Department of

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER